

**REMARKS**

By this Response, claims 1, 6, and 13 have been amended. Support for the amended claims is found in the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of this application as amended, and allowance of all pending claims are hereby respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

In Section 2 of the Office Action, dated September 1, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner raised rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on the contention that the claim term “the MOS transistor under the operating power supply voltage” recited in claim 1 and claim 6 lacks proper antecedent. In addition, the Examiner stated that the claim language regarding “under a supply voltage” is not understandable. By this Response, the Applicants have accordingly amended claims 1 and 6 to address the rejection.

Furthermore, the Examiner rejected claim 6 for lack of proper antecedent for “the converted voltage”. The Applicants have amended claim 6 to address the rejection. The Applicants also respectfully point out that the output of a current-voltage conversion circuit is a converted voltage.

Since the Applicants have addressed all the issues raised under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, with regard to claims 1 and 6, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

With regard to claims 13-16, Applicants respectfully point out that claim 13 is an independent claim and does not recite any of the terms based on which the Examiner raised rejection under §112, second paragraph. It is believed that the rejection of claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is mistaken. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

In this section of the Office Action, claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,397,934 issued to Merrill et al. (hereafter “Merrill”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Merrill discloses an apparatus and method for adjusting the effective *threshold voltage* of a MOS transistor (See Abstract). As disclosed in Merrill, an effective threshold voltage monitor 26 is employed that measures the effective threshold voltage of a MOS transistor and generates a second voltage signal that is to be compared with a first voltage signal generated by a reference voltage generation circuit. Based on the comparison result, the effective threshold voltage of the MOS transistor can be adjusted by adjusting the source-body voltage potential of the MOS transistor (see Fig. 1 and Abstract).

The present invention is directed to a circuit for controlling the saturation current value of a MOS transistor. Claim 1 recites: “a substrate potential control circuit controls the substrate potential of the MOS transistor in the main circuit *so that an actual saturation current value of the MOS transistor ... is equal to the target saturation current value*”. Claim 6 recites essentially the same features: “a substrate potential control circuit for controlling the substrate potential of the MOS transistor in the main circuit *so that an actual saturation current value of the MOS transistor ... is equal to a target saturation current value*”. In addition, claim 13

recites: “the power supply voltage control circuit controls a voltage value of the operating power supply voltage ... *so that an actual saturation current value of the MOS transistor of the main circuit is equal to the target saturation current value.*”

It is evident that the present invention is completely different from what is disclosed by Merrill. As discussed above, Merrill is directed to a circuit that adjusts a threshold voltage of a MOS transistor. However, Merrill fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a circuit that controls a saturation current value of a MOS transistor “*so that an actual saturation current value of the MOS transistor ... is equal to a target saturation current value*”, as claimed in claims 1, 6, and 13. As such, Merrill does not anticipate claims 1, 6, and 13. Thus, claims 1, 6, and 13 are patentable over Merrill. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 1, 6, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1. Thus, claims 2-5 are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 and for additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 2-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claims 7-12 depend from claim 6. Thus, claims 7-12 are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 6 and for additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

Claims 14-16 depend from claim 13. Thus, claims 14-16 are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 13 and for additional features recited therein. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 6-12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

By this Amendment, all rejections raised in the Office Action have been overcome. Therefore, it is believed that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests an early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application. If there are any outstanding issues which might be resolved by an interview or an Examiner's amendment, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's representative at the telephone number shown below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Michael E. Fogarty  
Registration No. 36,139

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.**

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF/QH:llg  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: November 30, 2005**